

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough review of the present application, and respectfully request reconsideration in light of the preceding amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-13 are pending in the application. Several claims have been amended to better define the claimed invention. The amended claims find solid support in the original specification and drawings, e.g., box 203 in FIG. 2. The Abstract has been placed in compliance with commonly accepted US patent practice. No new matter has been introduced through the foregoing amendments.

The **objection** to the Abstract is believed overcome in view of the above amendments.

The new **obviousness rejection of claims 1-7 and 9-13** over *McGarrahan* and *Kuh* is noted. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, because the applied references singly or in combination fail to disclose, teach or suggest all limitations of the rejected claims.

At the very least, none of the applied references teach or suggest the claim feature that the PSIP/PSI data from the terrestrial broadcasting TS or the SI/PSI data from the satellite broadcasting TS is converted into PSIP/PSI data of a corresponding digital cable television broadcasting standard.

In *McGarrahan*, IP-format video from content server 102/104/320/302 is multiplexed (at 310 in FIG. 3) with satellite DVB video received from receiver 316, and then the multiplexed stream is re-broadcasted via transmitter 118. There is a stream converter 314 between receiver 316 and multiplexer 310. There is, however, absolutely no disclosure in *McGarrahan* as to what the stream converter 314 does to the received satellite DVB video, and therefore, it cannot be said that *McGarrahan* teaches converting the received satellite DVB video into a different protocol.

Kuh appears to teach, in FIG. 3, an extractor 16 for separating the protocol (PSIP) data from the audio/video data, and an inserter 17 for reinserting the PSIP data into the video/audio stream. However, the extracted and then reinserted PSIP data is not converted into a different protocol. Rather, it is merely updated, i.e., maintains its original protocol. Therefore, in the Examiner's proposed combination, the *McGarrahan* satellite DVB video would be at best updated, rather than converted, as taught by *Kuh*. The Examiner's combination would clearly fail to teach or suggest the claimed invention.

Although Applicants do not necessarily agree with the Examiner's position for the reasons outlined above, amendments have nevertheless been made to specifically highlight the discussed distinction between the claimed invention and the art.

Particularly, independent **claim 1** now recites "protocol data converter for converting the PSIP/PSI data or the SI/PSI data extracted by the protocol data extractor into PSIP/PSI data of a corresponding digital cable television broadcasting standard." The applied art of record fails to teach or suggest this feature as detailed *supra* and, hence, amended claim 1 is patentable over the art.

Likewise, independent **claim 6** now recites the step of "analyzing and converting the extracted PSIP/PSI data or the SI/PSI data into the corresponding digital cable broadcasting PSIP/PSI data." The applied art of record fails to teach or suggest this feature as detailed *supra* and, hence, amended claim 6 is patentable over the art.

Finally, independent **claim 9** already recites "a plurality of first and second program and system information protocol (PSIP) converters for... converting a terrestrial broadcasting PSIP/PSI table and a satellite television broadcasting SI/PSI table for transmitting program and system information into PSIP/PSI tables of a corresponding digital cable television broadcasting standard, respectively." The applied art of record fails to teach or suggest this feature as detailed

supra and, hence, claim 9 is patentable over the art.

The **dependent claims** are considered patentable at least for the reason(s) advanced with respect to the respective independent claim(s).

Each of the Examiner's rejections has been traversed/overcome. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are now in condition for allowance. Early and favorable indication of allowance is courteously solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP

/Yoon S Ham/
Yoon S. Ham
Registration No. 45,307

Customer Number: 22429
1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
YSH/KL
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: July 22, 2008